

Guam and Puerto Rico were awarded as a result of that same war with Spain.

The Trust Territories of the Pacific, here, are held in trust by an agreement with the Security Council of the United Nations since 1947.

The philosophy of the American Government has been to give a large degree of self-government, autonomy, even independence. Two of these overseas territories have been admitted as equal states; namely, Hawaii and Alaska, in 1959. The Philippines were promised and received complete independence in 1946; Puerto Rico became a Commonwealth in 1952, a self-governing island, yet in matters of defense and foreign relations responsible to the United States. The peoples of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and many in the Canal Zone have been made citizens of the United States.

Developing self-government, aiding and encouraging the improvement of living conditions, education, health, the economy, remain the objectives of the American Government in the islands and territories under its administration.

In essence the plan of government outlined in 1787 has been pursued in all of these areas. The kind of government, the idea of stages of government, self-government, gradual representation by the people themselves—these are the principles deriving from the Ordinance of 1787. James Otis' assertion that "taxation without representation is tyranny" has been acknowledged in American administration of these lands.

Observing modern history one must notice two forces that have met and clashed in the decades since World War II. National self-determination and imperialism are incompatible objectives. The far-flung colonial empires have eroded and are fast disappearing. Benjamin Disraeli's plea in the 1870's for an "imperial country" rather than a "comfortable England" would fall today upon deaf ears. Nor would any colonies agree with the Greek Pericles that "to be within the circle of our influence is not dependence but privilege."

American sympathy rests with these emerging nations; our relations with those living under our flag evidences this fact. With Thomas Jefferson we believe that "The God who gave us life, gave us liberty at the same time." We believe, moreover, that this applies to all men.

Acutely aware of a new imperialism, present in today's world, President John F. Kennedy in a July 4 address in 1962 observed that: "If there is a single issue that divides the world today, it is independence * * *." The attitude of the United States toward this denial of freedom must be and is consistent with our affirmation of man's right to freedom almost 200 years ago. As President Kennedy reaffirmed:

"And today this Nation—conceived in revolution, nurtured in liberty, maturing in independence—has no intention of abdicating its leadership in that worldwide movement for independence to any nation or society committed to systematic human oppression."

Just as the success of the American experiment made the United States the hope, the model of the world, so may the success of this government in the new world of the Pacific community in cooperation with my Government, register another victory for government by the people, for the idea of popular government. The people of the United States welcome you to that community of nations which fosters freedom, encourages peace, prosperity, for its people. We ask that you join with us in this continuing endeavor to elevate mankind, to acquire and preserve the heritage of dignity and well-being which is man's to claim and possess in cooperation with one another.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, two Members of this House are on Saipan this week attending the first meetings of

the new Congress of Micronesia. My side of the aisle is represented by the Honorable ROGERS C. B. MORTON, the other side by the Honorable N. NEUMAN CRALEY, Jr. I am proud that our House of Representatives is so well represented at this newest of all the world's parliamentary bodies and I am glad that I, even at this great distance, should have this opportunity to welcome the Micronesian Congress to the ranks of those bodies throughout the world in which the voice of the people is heard.

To these remarks, Mr. Speaker, I want to append the address which the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MORTON] is giving to the assembled representatives of the Micronesian people. It is full of good sense and sound advice which all of us can take to heart. One paragraph in particular has caught my attention:

As an elected official of your own particular district, you have the responsibility to represent the interests of friends and neighbors with whom you share a common background and tradition. But you also represent the overriding interests of many individuals whom you have never met, of communities you have never visited, of islands you have never seen. In short you represent the public interest, and your success as a legislator will depend in no small degree on how well you are able to blend the needs of your community with the needs of all Micronesia.

This admonition is one that all of us, whether on Saipan or in Washington or New Delhi or Lima must constantly keep in mind. So are many other points made by Congressman MORTON which I shall not take the time to repeat. Let me merely say that I recommend study of the entire statement to my colleagues:

ADDRESS OF CONGRESSMAN ROGERS C. B. MORTON, REPUBLICAN OF MARYLAND, PREPARED FOR DELIVERY AT THE CONVENING OF THE 1ST SESSION OF THE CONGRESS OF MICRONESIA, AT SAIPAN, UNITED NATIONS TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS, JULY 12, 1965

Congressman CRALEY, High Commissioner Goding, Secretary Carver, members of the First Micronesian Congress and distinguished guests, I am deeply honored and proud to have been chosen to speak on this momentous occasion which is such an important milestone in the long and noble history of representative government.

I come bearing the greetings and congratulations of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Speaker of the House, and the minority leader. This legislative body was established under the provisions of our Constitution in 1789.

The development of a legislative system, in which the needs, aspirations and inalienable rights of all people can be served, is an arduous and complicated process even under the best of circumstances. As in building a house, one must carefully select a site, prepare an architectural plan and lay a solid foundation.

When these preliminary steps are overlooked, or, in the eagerness to present an impressive facade, they are carelessly considered, then it is only a matter of time before the structure will fall before the forces of wind and water. So it is with men and the institutions of government they build.

The preparations for representative government and a legislative system for the trust territory have been underway for nearly 20 years. I believe it is fitting, and indeed important, that we take a moment during these early proceedings to examine a few of the preliminary steps in the building of the Congress of Micronesia.

As a result of World War II, my Govern-

ment assumed the administrative responsibility for an area about as large as the continental United States, an area comprising some 2,100 islands spread across approximately 3 million square miles of ocean. Although the inhabited land mass was considerably less than our smallest State, Rhode Island, more than 2,400 miles and at least nine indigenous languages separated the peoples and communities of the trust territory.

If the site upon which to build a Micronesian house of government offered problems of cohesiveness and communications, then these problems had to be overcome by sound architectural planning and a carefully laid foundation.

Twelve years ago, at a meeting at Truk, island leaders from the Mariannas, the Marshalls and the Carolines decided to move slowly and cautiously in establishing a territorial legislature for Micronesia. They were determined to avoid what one observer called elements of disastrous friction which might result from premature actions. A second conference in 1957 led to the setting up of an Inter-District Advisory Council which met for 1 week each year.

By 1959, district congresses were in operation in Ponape, Palau, Truk, and the Marshalls and many of the other islands had established elective municipal councils. In spite of the obstacles of distance and differences, you were showing the United States, and world, that you believe deeply in the principles of responsible self-government and that you would leave no stone unturned to reach this objective.

The Advisory Council of Micronesia, whose members had originally been appointed by the High Commissioner, worked out an elective system based upon local and district legislative organs, and popular elections were provided for by 1962. The next step was careful study to set up a truly legislative system with authentic powers to levy taxes and to participate in the formulation of the budget.

The immediate result of this painstaking labor, and the close cooperation of the U.S. Government and your island leaders is the opening of the first Micronesian Congress which we celebrate today. The long range result will involve no less than the efforts of the past, and no less than the best of each of you assembled here at Saipan are able to give for the future.

For I am convinced that no grand political design, no instant economic windfall—none of these will do as much to chart a course of success and prosperity for Micronesia as will your constant diligence and imagination as elected legislators.

It is in your hands to develop an effective governmental operation to serve the widespread interests of your widespread constituents. It is in your hands to forge a Micronesian identity from among the many diverse peoples who have placed their trust in each of you. It is in your hands if a sprinkling of tiny islands in the world's largest ocean are to be welded into a meaningful unit of order and well-being.

Thus as a member of this historic First Congress, you will be judged not only as legislator taking part in the planning and drafting of the rules and regulations that will affect all Micronesians for many years to come; you will be graded also on your ability to cope with everyday problems, as well as your vision of distant goals and aspirations. You will make your mark not just for the appearance of your name on major legislation, but also for your behind-the-scenes efforts in committees where the real fruits of all congresses are planted.

As an elected official of your own particular district, you have the responsibility to represent the interests of friends and neighbors with whom you share a common background and tradition. But you also represent the overriding interests of many individuals whom you have never met, of com-

July 15, 1965

munities you have never visited, of islands you have never seen. In short you represent the public interest, and your success as a legislator will depend in no small degree on how well you are able to blend the needs of your community with the needs of all Micronesia.

If then, members of this initial Congress are legislators and public servants, then too they must function as educators as well. For the full meaning of representative Government can only be realized when the great majority of citizens come to know and understand the workings of a democratic system.

As this is the first session of the territorial Congress, your work in the educational field is cut out for you. I understand that you have been studying parliamentary procedures and other congressional functions under the able guidance of your legislative counsel, Dr. Robbins.

This is an important beginning if your assembly is to make the most of its short session, and is to undertake the task of preparing a realistic annual legislative program. But just as important will be the steps you initiate to inform your constituents of the programs under consideration and the differing views of your fellow Congressmen on local and territorial issues.

So add to your growing list of responsibilities that of communicator. During those periods when the Congress is in session, and at other times when you gather for committee meetings, make every effort to be in contact with your district by mail and by all available communications facilities. With hundreds of islands separated by thousands of miles of water, the power of a personal letter should not be underestimated.

After a lengthy congressional meeting, sit down with the notes of the day's events, put them in readable and understandable form, and send them off to an island leader in your home district with instructions to give your summary the widest possible dissemination. I think you will find the results worthwhile, not only for your new Congress, but for your personal political careers as well.

Under the terms of the order establishing the First Micronesian Congress, the legislature will be in session for a 1-month period each year. It is likely that your various committees will be meeting at other times, in other places, according to the need for additional legislative preparation.

I cannot stress too strongly that the responsibilities of government will not disappear with the end of your meeting here at Saipan this month, but they will follow each and every member of this assembly as he returns to family, job, and community. The role of legislator, of public servant, of educator, and of communicator, will weigh upon your shoulders as you assume your normal duties at home.

But it is a weight that all freemen must bear, and one that gives the upright in character and proud in spirit a new strength for the problems that lie ahead. The very fact that this is your first congressional session underscores the inevitable struggles and obstacles that must be faced in the future if the concept of self-government is to endure.

In the earliest days of the United States of America, that very name was held up to scorn and ridicule because our Nation's leaders were unable, or unwilling, to submerge their local interests for the common good. There were those who said our young Government would not find its way out of a wilderness of petty strife and costly bickering that had produced bitter division and runaway debt.

It was only through the selfless deliberations and actions of leaders not unlike this group assembled here today that the United States of America was able to pull itself together, bind its wounds and face the future. And for many years, a bleak future it was.

There is a real and deep significance in this first meeting of the Congress of Micronesia.

You are telling all who would listen that your people are determined to face the future as free men and women. You are committing your people to a form of government that has offered these who would accept its challenge more of the blessings of liberty than any other system yet devised by the mind of man.

You are charting a course for this island complex that can only lead to individual achievement and community development. In this task, you will have the wholehearted support and admiration of the Congress of the United States. We applaud your action, and await with confidence your accomplishments.

Fe. (On) Lipscomb
VIETNAM MONEY SUPPORT
INADEQUATE

(Mr. LIPSCOMB asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, the increasingly heavy defense expenditures in support of the action in Vietnam and our worldwide commitments demand that the President and Congress act immediately to provide adequate funds to carry out U.S. policies successfully.

When the fiscal year 1966 Defense appropriation bill came up in the House of Representatives on June 23, 1965, deep concern was expressed over the fact that there is insufficient funding in the budget to support the escalated action in Vietnam.

Subsequent events have served to underscore the urgency of the situation and the importance of acting now to provide the necessary funding.

Here are some of the major events that have and are happening which largely were not taken into consideration by the Defense Department in the budget request:

Significant increases in manpower are being committed to South Vietnam;

Large increases in equipment and combat consumables are required to support the escalated effort;

An increase in air and surface transportation is required to move both men and material;

Replacement of stocks and equipment to those units from which they have been taken is needed;

Replacement is needed of reserve stocks as rapidly as possible so that we may be prepared for other eventualities;

There is an increase in combat pay which was unprogrammed;

An airmobile division is to be created and its anticipated deployment to South Vietnam, all of which was unprogrammed.

During the floor debate on June 23, 1965, I stated:

The fiscal year 1966 budget contains insufficient funding for the Vietnamese effort. The President has made certain policy decisions affecting our position and commitments in Vietnam. This commitment includes the large-scale introductions of American personnel and equipment. The decisions to commit American lives and American prestige must be backed up and supported with the appropriations necessary to carry them out successfully.

This concern, however, related not just to Vietnam but to other areas as well, as I stated:

It is also of serious concern that equipment and material priorities for Vietnam

must not be permitted to so deplete active forces inventory as to impair the readiness of our forces not committed to Vietnam. Our forces no matter where they are located, must be sufficiently equipped to respond to any emergency. Reserve stocks are for the purpose of having available a sufficient inventory to take care of the unknown and unpredictable events that could occur all over the world. The Dominican Republic is a recent example.

It is particularly significant that a review of the House debate on the defense appropriation bill would clearly show that this position was not refuted. To the contrary, it was largely substantiated. The only item which was introduced during the debate in an attempt to answer the charge was a letter written by Secretary of Defense McNamara June 9, 1965. Rather than deny the correctness of the position, however, the letter serves to reinforce it.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the escalated activities in Vietnam are in significant amounts and that additional equipment and replacements are required. Secretary McNamara claims that he has sufficient flexibility through such means as emergency funds and transfer authority to cover any immediate needs. Based upon existing procedures the Department of Defense does have the ability to use emergency funds and transfers from other programs, but these procedures are intended to be used for emergency situations which were not known at the time of a budget request, or when Congress is not in session. Certainly the situation in Vietnam and the readiness condition of our other units are sufficiently known so that they can be provided for in the fiscal year 1966 budget, on which final action is still pending in Congress. To use the means indicated by the Secretary of Defense would be a misuse of the authority granted by Congress.

Secretary McNamara has indicated, and properly so, that he has given top priority to the needs of Vietnam. But to accomplish this, equipment and stocks have been taken from other units and evidence is accumulating that such units are falling below their authorized needs. In simple words, we are robbing Peter to pay Paul.

A clear-cut example is a decision which was at the request of the Chief of Staff, USAF, to transfer, since January 1965, 20 RB-57 jet aircraft from 5 Air National Guard units throughout the country and place them in the Active Air Force inventory for Vietnam. This action has resulted in the Air National Guard being under authorized strength for this component. These aircraft must be replaced. The production line for the RB-57 has been closed, and if some other aircraft is substituted, that in turn would probably require replacement. No provision for this type of action has been specifically included in the budget.

In another instance, the Army had recommended a production rate of the UH-1B & D Iroquois helicopters at 75 a month. Secretary McNamara reduced this request to 60 a month. It has now been reported that the production rate has been raised to 70. Again, these additional costs are not covered in the fiscal year 1966 budget.

For the fiscal year 1965, the Army request for procurement of ammunition was \$408 million. In fiscal year 1966, in spite of Vietnam, the request for ammunition was \$344.9 million. Even though the fiscal year 1965 budget request for ammunition was made on the basis of real need for both current usage and to provide an adequate level of stocks, during the hearings it was brought out that only \$272 million would be spent. This type of action has occurred in previous years. Such large differences between what is requested and what is finally spent raises serious questions as to what our actual stock level is relative to ammunition.

Obviously this is a vital area and the current degree of action in Vietnam clearly dictates a high level of consumption. It has been reported that consumption of ammunition in Vietnam has quadrupled.

A related area is spare parts and maintenance. During the course of the Defense appropriation hearings, the Navy stated that the budget for the replenishment of spare parts is tight primarily due to stricter guidelines which were imposed on them. A principal Navy witness stated:

We will make every effort to operate with this level, but we are concerned and will have to watch very carefully any effect upon our ability to meet expanded requirements if those should come about as a result of the southeast Asia operations in concern of the very long supply lines in that area.

Certainly the problem of combat pay is particularly important, far beyond the basic fiscal considerations. The Department of Defense issued a directive, No. 1340.6, on June 2, 1965, concerning the eligibility of military personnel to receive special "combat pay" for those subject to hostile fire.

Under the previous special pay policy, about one-fourth of the military personnel serving in South Vietnam have been receiving hostile-fire payments monthly. Under this new modified policy, all U.S. military personnel serving in South Vietnam will be eligible for the special pay, unless certain areas are excepted by the unified commander. This new policy is completely warranted under existing conditions and if anything is overdue. In any event, this directive creates an increase in personnel pay amounting to many millions of dollars, which was unprogrammed and therefore not covered in the budget. We have been constantly told this is an extremely tight budget, and in the area of pay there is not the flexibility as in other parts of the budget.

Other items that further illustrate the inadequacy of the fiscal year 1966 budget, as they were either not programmed or budgeted at the presently planned level include:

The decision to significantly increase ground troops in South Vietnam.

The Navy, it has been reported, has been spread thin, with the 7th Fleet now employing four and at times five aircraft carriers off Vietnam and adding a new naval patrol command off the South Vietnamese coast.

It has been further reported that surface shipments of material have

mounted to 125,000 tons a month, while air shipments have reached a record 35,000 tons a month. Imports of petroleum products have increased to 500,000 barrels a month.

Also reported is the probability that the new 1st Calvary "airmobile" division will go to Vietnam. This is a new concept for which tests had recently been completed. The division will be larger than a normal Army division, having close to 16,000 men and will contain increased air capability particularly helicopters for quick mobility. There were no plans in the fiscal year 1966 budget to create such a division, much less to deploy it into active combat in Vietnam. It has now also been reported that there is a distinct possibility that a second "airmobile" division will be created. This too was unplanned.

It is a fact that we are carrying out added activities and that they must be funded. This should be accomplished in a timely, reasonable manner, completely in keeping with the right of Congress and the public to know how much is being spent, when it is being spent, and for what purpose.

Considering the international situation, we must be in a secure position militarily. This includes having an adequate budget which will provide for the current defense needs and equally important, future emergencies. Adequate money and adequate equipment must be provided for every unit at a proper level according to the table of organization and priority position. We have consistently been told the fiscal year 1966 defense budget is a tight budget. Any budget manipulations to solve the problems mentioned here must therefore have serious effects upon other programs unless additional funds are provided. This must not be allowed to happen. Fortunately we have an opportunity to correct this situation and maintain our high level of strength which now exists. The fiscal year 1966 Defense appropriation bill has not cleared the Congress and therefore the President can revise the defense budget, or submit a supplemental request immediately.

If this is not done, it will not merely be a question of having available adequate funds, but the additional question must then be raised as to what is this administration's approach to military preparedness.

THE TRADITIONAL AMERICAN SPIRIT

(Mr. MARTIN of Alabama asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, today I received a copy of a letter directed to a Member of the other body. The message it contained is so much needed today and so exemplifies the spirit of the true American character, that I would like to share a part of this letter with you. It was written by Mrs. Eva M. Harmon of Birmingham, Ala., and contains this message of courage and indomitable spirit. I include this excerpt from Mrs. Harmon's letter as a part of these remarks:

When I read of the rent subsidy proposal, I did not write. I thought no Alabamian, no southerner would support it. But I see by our local papers that you did.

You mention housing for a number of groups. What I want to know is, when is the Federal Government going to quit putting a premium on so-called poverty? How many of our poverty stricken people will want to try to better themselves if the Government will do it for them, with no effort on their part?

You spoke of the handicapped. That is not exactly a foreign word to me. At 10 months of age I had polio which left me handicapped, if you choose to call it that; at least it left me lame.

When I was old enough to leave home and go out on my own, I chose a work that would be a real challenge to me—I wanted to be a linotype operator in a newspaper office. At that time that was a man's job; in the past few years with more modern equipment, more women are employed. When I went to Nashville, Tenn., for training, the instructor tried in every way possible to persuade me to take another course, even holding me up to ridicule before the entire class when I made an error. Finally, at graduation time, he apologized to me before the class.

I say all that to say this: What's wrong with people working and taking care of themselves without the Federal Government stepping in with a handout? There is a principle involved here, and I would like to see us get back to that good old American spirit of independence.

I have always felt that it was my inalienable right to work and take care of myself, and with God's help I have done it. I had to work hard, I had to be better in my job than the men. And now at 64 I think I still am. I have always enjoyed my work, and the fruits of my work. Last December I fulfilled a life-long ambition—I toured the Holy Land, going with a Billy Graham group.

You say you have always voted for the aid programs and always will. Well, I just want to say I feel sorry for the people who will be denied the satisfaction in their lives that I have enjoyed.

Mr. Speaker, for this message from Mrs. Harmon, I say, "God bless her," and I express my deep thanks for giving us a message that should go to the heart of every liberty-loving American.

YOUNG PEOPLE OF THE KEY CLUBS OF THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA

(Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I would like to give special recognition today to the young people of the Key Clubs of the United States and Canada.

These high school clubs sponsored by Kiwanis International are rendering valuable service to communities throughout our land.

I know that my colleagues would like to join me in welcoming these young people to Washington, and I especially welcome almost 100 Key Club members from Knoxville, Tenn.

BETTS FINDS TAFT GRAVE ALMOST FORGOTTEN

(Mr. BETTS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, as you know, an Honor Guard is on duty at Arlington Cemetery in part to assist the many visitors who come there. It was disappointing to learn that some of the Honor Guards do not know that President William Howard Taft is buried there nor the general location of his grave.

At several entrances to the cemetery large maps have been erected to guide visitors to particular points of interest. These maps list the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier, the Superintendent's Office, Custis Lee Mansion, and President Kennedy's grave. Certainly the location of the graves of President and Mrs. Taft should be on such maps.

Various trails have been established for visitors to follow in touring the cemetery and there are a number of signs pointing only to the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier and the Kennedy gravesite. To my knowledge, nowhere in the cemetery is there any official recognition of the Taft grave.

If one finds the Taft grave and marker he is immediately struck by the fact that the grounds surrounding it are not well kept, patches of grass are burned and the area needs to be raked and watered. Perhaps a stone walkway up the hill to the grave would be in order and a small sign at the roadway pointing to the grave. This seems to be the minimum attention that could be shown to a former President of the United States. I would hope that such a proposal would be considered by those having responsibility at the cemetery.

THE LATE HONORABLE ADLAI STEVENSON

(Mr. REID of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I believe that all Americans; indeed people throughout the free world and all Members in this House were deeply saddened at the tragic and sudden death of Adlai Stevenson in London yesterday.

Mr. Speaker, Governor Stevenson died in the service of his country upholding the best interests of the United States and the United Nations; man's best hope for peace.

Mr. Speaker, his warm and enduring concern for the rights of man and for all those who are oppressed wherever they might be, and his eloquent voice on behalf of collective security and peace throughout the world, distinguished the efforts of the United Nations and will endure for many years to come.

Governor Stevenson was a man of principle and of wit, a moving force for social and economic progress in our country, a voice of conscience at home and abroad, and a statesman who will be deeply missed in the councils of the nations of the world.

Mr. Speaker, I join with every Member in this House in extending our deepest sympathy to the members of his family.

We shall not see his like again.

"IT'S WHAT'S HAPPENING, BABY"—DISGRACEFUL AND DIGUSTING

(Mr. BUCHANAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, over 2 weeks ago the CBS television network presented a 90-minute program entitled "It's What's Happening, Baby." I have received letters, as I am sure many of my colleagues have, protesting against the contents of the program. "Disgraceful" and "disgusting" are two words which are repeated again and again in these letters of protest.

It would appear that no Federal funds in any significant amount were expended on this program. The great part of the program was devoted to what passes for entertainment these days in some quarters.

What concerns me is that the Federal Government apparently believes it must resort to this sort of perverted communications because otherwise it would not be listened to by the Nation's young people.

Mr. Speaker, I refuse to believe that this is the only way to communicate with teenagers, even with dropouts. Certainly, they are capable of understanding something more than the wallings of "The Cannibals," and "The Headhunters," two groups who cavorted about the stage that night.

As I understand it, one purpose of the OEO is to improve, to raise the standards of the young. Well, you do not improve someone by pandering to his base instincts and by using the lowest possible denominator.

Mr. Speaker, the commercials during the program urged the listeners to write to "New Chance, Washington." I suggest that unless the Office of Economic Opportunity and Mr. Shriver and his aids reexamine their basic approach, it may be "Last Chance, Washington," to which the American people will be writing.

We have one last chance, Mr. Speaker, to help these young by appealing to the best in them—not the worst; by inspiring them, not entertaining them; by stretching their minds and spirits, not numbing them. I, for one, refuse to accept the notion that the best way to communicate with young Americans is through African tribal rhythms. It happened once. It should not happen again.

GALLAGHER INTRODUCES LEGISLATION TO VIRTUALLY ABOLISH THE USE OF "LIE DETECTORS" BY FEDERAL AGENCIES

(Mr. GALLAGHER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute with reference to a bill which he has introduced on prohibiting lie detector tests.)

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation which would, in practical effect, prohibit the use of polygraph machines—the so-called lie detector—by all agencies of the Federal Government. The only excep-

tion would be in rare cases where there was extraordinary necessity to use such a device in protecting the national interest of the United States. Frankly, I doubt if these cases really exist or ever would exist. But the authority would be available in any event.

It was more than 2 years ago that I requested the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Government Operations [Mr. Dawson], the gentleman from Illinois, to look into this practice. He responded immediately and directed the Foreign Operations and Government Information Subcommittee to study this matter. The subcommittee, under the able leadership of the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss], has done an excellent job and is continuing to do so. In its report issued March 22, 1965, the committee came to this conclusion on its very first page. Allow me to quote it to Members of the House:

There is no "lie detector," neither machine nor human. People have been deceived by a myth that a metal box in the hands of an investigator can detect truth or falsehood.

Mr. Speaker, the committee found that the Federal Government has fostered this myth by spending millions of dollars on polygraph machines and on salaries for hundreds of Federal investigators to give thousands of polygraph examinations. Yet research completed so far has failed to prove that polygraph interrogation actually detects lies or determines guilt or innocence.

In addition, the committee found that the overwhelming majority of Federal investigators who operate polygraphs have neither the qualifications nor the training for their work. Most Federal agencies had such weak controls over the use of polygraphs that these operators were permitted to give examinations without top-level agency approval.

Individuals under interrogation are persuaded to disclose past indiscretions, and investigators often ignore the so-called voluntary nature of the examination by noting in Government files any refusal to submit to the polygraph test. Compounding the injustice of these practices are the two-way mirrors and hidden microphones in these Federal star chambers.

The committee further found that Federal investigators rely on these examinations for everything from top security matters to minor pilfering cases.

Thus, in the words of the committee's report:

The polygraph examination has become a crutch in too many cases, replacing proven procedures of criminal investigation and serving as a weak link in our security system.

Testimony before the subcommittee showed that the Federal Bureau of Investigation does not consider the polygraph precise enough for screening its own personnel and job applicants. Yet, other Government agencies and a number of private industries use it for just that purpose.

The committee's main recommendation, in my opinion, was that the Fed-

This is a logical and reasonable solution of our problem. The vast majority of countries in the world today produce coins which are not related to the actual value of the piece itself, but derive their value from the credit of the Government which issues them. In this respect, they are similar to paper money which constitutes a promise to pay rather than embodying any value itself.

I support the solution recommended by the committee in this bill. I believe that we are meeting a modern problem with modern means and that there will be no damaging effects on the commerce or credit of the United States. I will vote for this bill and I hope that it will pass.

Jeffery C. Cohelan
At War in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 15, 1965

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times, in its lead editorial of July 14, has presented both a thoughtful and a sobering evaluation of the war in Vietnam.

I commend it to our colleagues for their attention:

AT WAR IN VIETNAM

President Johnson has confirmed what most people realize—that the United States is faced with “new and serious decisions” in meeting the challenge of Vietnam. Although it is still not officially acknowledged, the United States is fighting a land war of steady growing proportions in Asia. This is a momentous development in American history and it should be treated as such and not as a minor and soon-to-be-ended expedition to advise and bolster the Saigon government.

A major effort, of great cost in men, money, and materiel, stretching over a period of years, is now in sight. If North Vietnam and her Communist Chinese backer should give in after this monsoon or the next one, there will be reason for rejoicing; but this is not to be expected. As a Times correspondent writes from Saigon, the South Vietnamese are close to the point where they will be unable to carry on as the major fighting force.

Until now this has been largely a war of Vietnamese against Vietnamese. The general who commanded the Vietminh against the French—Nguyen Giap—is commanding the Vietcong, and his tactics are proving as successful today as they were then. They are the same guerrilla tactics that Mao Tse-tung used in defeating Chiang Kai-shek.

However, the United States is not going to be worn down and pushed out of Vietnam as the French were. France could not commit the men, planes, ships, and materiel which the United States possesses in unlimited quantities. At the same time it is folly to send American troops to meet Vietcong guerrillas on their own terms in their chosen territory, far from their bases in tropical jungles. Furthermore, a perennially shaky government in Saigon and poor Vietnamese military leadership at the top make a weak backstop. There is always the possibility that a future government in Saigon might ask the Americans to leave, thus ending the legal basis for the American presence; but at least this is one problem that does not have to be faced now.

At matters stand, the United States is presented with some difficult alternatives. One is to establish a series of unconquerable beachheads along the coast and a perimeter around Saigon, and then hold on until the situation changes and negotiations on honorable terms become possible. Another, which in our view would constitute a disastrous escalation, would be to carry the war farther and more heavily into North Vietnam, with the strong possibility of directly involving Communist China, not to mention the Soviet Union. Another, equally disastrous but for different reasons, would be a decision to get out now—an obviously unacceptable move under present circumstances.

There are of course still other alternatives; but of all these unpleasant choices, the best seems to be to dig in at a number of coastal strong points where the overwhelming American naval and air superiority would be used defensively and with great effect. This may in fact be shaping up as the American strategy; but if so the American people should be prepared. Congress ought to be asked more definitively to face the fact that the country really is at war, and to take a greater burden of responsibility. The congressional declaration of last summer, and the \$700 million authorization for Vietnam seem almost irrelevant at this stage.

Vietnam is a different kind of war from Korea but it is a war, one that the Nation must recognize as such; and it is time to say so.

Few Motorists Use Seat Belts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 15, 1965

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, a routine report by the Maryland State Police states that of the 37 persons injured in highway accidents in 1 week, 28 could have been saved from serious injury by the use of seat belts.

The Community News, of Reisterstown, Md., published the summary of the report without comment. The statement of Colonel Jarman, superintendent of State police, whose men investigate these accidents, is commentary enough. Colonel Jarman said:

It is hard to understand the reluctance of the motorist to use seat belts.

I include the story from the Community News in the interest of further motorist education:

FEW MOTORISTS USE SEAT BELTS

Last week the Maryland State Police investigated 20 serious highway accidents in which 3 persons were killed and 37 injured. The investigators are of the opinion that the seriousness of the injuries would have been lessened in 28 of the 40 cases, if seat belts had been in use.

In only 7 of the 40 seats occupied by the persons killed or injured were seat belts available. In only two of these cases were they actually in use.

“In the light of the proven lifesaving capability of seat belts,” commented Col. Carey Jarman, superintendent of the State police, “it is hard to understand the reluctance of the motorist to use them. I suppose a part of this reluctance is due to an attitude of ‘take a chance, it won’t happen to me.’”

“The State trooper,” continued the superintendent, “wants no part of this gamble with his life. He knows the value of seat belts and he always buckles up before he starts.”

Voting Rights Act of 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 15, 1965

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, under leave for all Members to extend their remarks on the Voting Rights Act of 1965, I wish to commend those who, acting in good faith, were not stampeded into supporting a measure which I consider to contain undesirable, unnecessary, and unconstitutional provisions—and which discriminates not only against certain geographical areas, but even against the Negro who is now subjected to a numbers game based on an arbitrary 50 percent participation figure.

Mr. Speaker, I am not anti-civil-rights, nor am I anti-voting-rights.

On May 17, under previous order of the House, I took the floor to explain my position on the then pending voting rights bill. In order that there may be no doubt as to my position, I repeat that statement at this point in these remarks:

AN ANALYSIS OF THE VOTING RIGHTS CONTROVERSY

(A speech by the Honorable GEORGE V. HANSEN, in the House of Representatives, May 17, 1965)

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, the honored and respected Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, has recently made some remarks about civil disorders and civil disobedience—and zealots and bigots and racists—that we might well heed as we approach a decision on voting rights legislation.

In the December 1964, FBI law enforcement bulletin, distributed to all law enforcement officials, Mr. Hoover said, in part: “Our society today is in a great state of unrest. Many citizens are confused and troubled. For the first time, some are confronted with issues and decisions relating to the rights and dignity of their fellow countrymen, problems which heretofore they had skirted or ignored.”

“We have in our midst hatemongers, bigots, and riotous agitators, many of whom are at opposite poles philosophically but who spew similar doctrines of prejudice and intolerance. They exploit hate and fear for personal gain and self-aggrandizement. They distort facts, spread rumors, and pit one element of our people against another. There is a dogma of intimidation and terror.”

In a speech delivered in New York on December 12, 1964, on crime and subversion in the United States—and referring to some of the persons and groups involved—Mr. Hoover said, “And I include the false liberals of the extreme left, such as the Communist Party, as well as the counterfeit patriots at the fanatic limits of the far right, such as the Ku Klux Klan, who not only take the law into their own hands on occasion, but who would use the Constitution and laws of the United States to defeat the very purpose for which they were drafted—liberty and justice for all.”

July 15, 1965

Also—in the words of Mr. Hoover in testimony on January 29, 1964, before a House appropriations subcommittee: "Turning to the subject of Communist interest in Negro activities, the approximate 20 million Negroes in the United States today constitute the largest and most important racial target of the Communist Party, U.S.A. The infiltration, exploitation, and control of the Negro population has long been a party goal and is one of the principal goals today."

After stating that the Communist has no honest desire to better the status or condition of the Negro, Mr. Hoover said, "Communists . . . capitalize on the adverse propaganda effect that reports of discrimination and oppression in the United States can produce in the eyes of the rest of the world, particularly among the African and Asian peoples; that is, the idea that this country is against equal rights for all races."

As to the number of Negroes who have joined the Communist Party, Mr. Hoover had this to say: "The number of Communist Party recruits which may be attracted from the large Negro racial group in this Nation is not the important thing. The old Communist principle still holds: 'Communism must be built with non-Communist hands.'"

"We do know that Communist influence does exist in the Negro movement and it is this influence which is vitally important. It can be the means through which large masses are caused to lose perspective on the issues involved and, without realizing it, succumb to the party's propaganda lures."

This, Mr. Speaker, I believe to be a significant part of the current controversy over civil rights and voting rights. Unquestionably, the vast majority of those involved in the disputes are sincere, honest, and dedicated persons. However, on both sides there are those who masquerade behind ill-founded social, moral, political, and religious concern to practice intolerance, provocation, intimidation, and even downright lawlessness which all too often plays into the hands of our international enemies. Racial bigots and human flotsam only serve to detract from legitimate causes and, by their actions, cloud the real issues at stake. And it is the actions of these minorities within the two camps which make a difficult situation almost impossible.

The trouble is compounded by the presence of Communists who, though not necessarily the originators of demonstrations, at times push them to extremes. Dr. James N. M. Nabrit, Jr., president of Howard University, one of our country's leading Negro colleges, has said he has seen known Communists in a student picket line. Of the infiltration of Communists into civil rights groups, Dr. Nabrit said, "They are people who cloak themselves in the mantle of civil rights and plot and plan in secret to disrupt our fight for justice and full citizenship. They must be unmasked for the frauds they are. They must be fought in every arena, and they must not be allowed to prevail."

Some Negro leaders, unlike Dr. Nabrit who clearly recognizes the peril of Communist infiltration of the civil rights movement, have admitted that Communists do exist within the organizations, but say they have no influence. Unfortunately, the tactics and techniques of the Communists are not always apparent to these leaders, thus enabling the Red agents to carry on their nefarious work undetected.

The average person, in attempting to evaluate the racial situation and pinpoint the real problems, is frequently frustrated and puzzled by contradictory contentions and overstatements. It is obvious that critics of civil rights demonstrations are prone to minimize any good elements in the movements, and emphasize only the sordid and ugly. On the other hand, supporters tend just as strongly to overlook the undignified and disgraceful actions of some of the civil rights

groups and emphasize only the altruistic and philosophic goals they themselves have set.

Those supporting civil rights groups often tend to play to the hilt any acts of violence which occur, while, conversely, such violence has often been played down and even condoned by those opposing these movements and the perpetrators let off with a slap on the wrist by "juries of their peers."

To me, these positions appear to be untenable. It is difficult for me to see the compatibility between civil disobedience—which is advertised as nonviolent, but which is certainly provocative of violence—and the winning of the Nobel Peace Prize. It is equally difficult for me to see the compatibility between pleas for the sovereignty of local government and the unpunished bombing of churches and the midnight rifle shot on a lonely road.

Neither side, Mr. Speaker, is in a position to criticize the other for violations of the law. How can the one criticize the other for terrorist tactics when it, itself, decides which laws are "good" and which are "bad" and then obeys only the "good" laws? And how can the other side criticize this course when some of its members apparently feel that laws against murder are not valid and need not be obeyed when such laws interfere with what they consider to be their "rights?"

Ours is a process of law—of law and order. This process in America has never been both mother and stepchild of hysteria—which too often allows the rabble of contending sides to predominate in killings, intimidations, immoral conduct, and the like.

The Government of the United States, through its many years of growth from a small group of colonies to the greatest nation the world has ever known, has always placed the impartiality of law above the whims of man. That law has always contained processes for meeting and correcting social injustices; including the right of petition, the enactment of legislation, and access to the courts.

Contrary to the belief held by some, the United States is not merely a democracy, it is a constitutional Republic. It is important to note that political philosophers over the centuries have held that a pure democracy is the worst possible form of government, leading to impulsive and precipitous action by a sometimes hysterical majority, or mob, triggered by emotional circumstances.

Our constitutional Republic, with its various checks and balances, provides the processes that help protect us from the worst in ourselves. At times these processes may seem unduly slow and cumbersome—it may even seem that they are roadblocks preventing progress. But it is these roadblocks, lacking in a pure democracy, which give our constitutional Republic its strength and stability and provide for lasting solutions to our problems.

No one can deny, Mr. Speaker, that great strides have been made in the eradication of social injustices in the United States in recent years. Some of the actions which have attempted to give to all our citizens the rights and responsibilities inherent in our Constitution have come voluntarily from the private sector of our social order; some have been accomplished through legislation; some by directives of the executive branch; and some by the various levels of our courts.

We are moving forward, but I believe there is still a long way to go. I also believe that, when we speak of civil rights and the equality of all men, who too often confine our thoughts to the Negro and the problems he faces, and disregard the many injustices heaped upon the American Indian and foreign nationality groups concentrated in the slums and ghettos of our larger cities. These groups, lacking the potent political potential of the Negro, are often left to suffer and shift for themselves.

By the same token, when we refer to voting rights we are prone to think only of

practices which deprive a man of his vote. Abhorrent as this practice is, equally as abhorrent—and almost as prevalent—is the practice of negating a man's vote through fraudulent voting, ballot box stuffing, and other illegal election practices. While untold numbers, particularly in the South, are denied the right to vote, there is also substantial evidence that untold numbers, particularly in large cities, have their votes canceled by fictitious names and tombstones.

Mr. Speaker, it is my firm belief that adequate machinery does now exist under present laws and under the 14th and 15th amendments to the Constitution—if properly implemented by conscientious officials—to correct voting injustices and to attain the goals which some are trying to accomplish through demonstrations involving civil disobedience which, no matter how well intended, subvert the very rule of law itself.

In this connection, I am convinced that any administration, political party, group or individual exploiting civil disobedience for self-aggrandizement is toying with a very explosive and possibly destructive force.

This course of action makes us vulnerable to the designs of the cunning Communist who, by infiltration, deceit, and the perpetration of any crime in the name of Communist triumph, has subjugated more than half the people of the world. The Communists have perfected the technique of "divide and conquer" to a point never envisaged by another recent group who employed this method—the Nazis. Communist imperialistic designs and subversive activities have set Chinese against Chinese, Korean against Korean, Cuban against Cuban, Vietnamese against Vietnamese, and now are attempting to set American against American at every opportunity.

Now—as stated previously, we already have the laws necessary for the eradication of social injustice. Prolonged apathy by various Departments of the Federal Government in seeing that these laws are applied is largely responsible for current controversies and the resultant demand for drastic Federal action—action which I deem to be unnecessary and, in some cases unconstitutional.

As an example—article I, section 2 of the Constitution and the 17th amendment give to the States the right to determine voter qualifications, and the 10th amendment prohibits the Federal Government from doing so. By the same token, the 14th and 15th amendments provide that no discrimination shall occur.

Hence, to me it is basic that the States can legally prescribe any tests or requirements for voting, consistent with the Federal Constitution, which the electorate of that State will approve. Then, and to me this is also basic, it is up to each of us, beginning with the lower subdivisions of Government, to see that these tests are applied without prejudice or discrimination. If violations occur at the local and county levels, then the State should exercise its authority. Only if the State refuses to do this (and obviously there are cases where this is so), should the Federal Government have the right and duty to step in.

Emphatically, I believe that we, as citizens, should do everything legally possible at all levels of Government to overcome existing inequities. Had more concerted action been previously taken, we would not now be undergoing great emotional disturbances such as the current civil rights demonstrations.

Hasty, poorly conceived legislation designed to bridge the gap created by poor enforcement of existing laws, holds out false hope to those concerned. Rather than passing arbitrary legislation and resorting to unconstitutional processes in an attempt to cure the evils which beset us, I believe the more valid answer lies in proper enforcement of existing laws and adequate education.

July 15, 1965

A3783

voted the Republican ticket, and this was understandable since they remembered Abraham Lincoln as the emancipator and the democratic strategy was still based on the solid South plus one or two of the larger Northern States.

I am very sure that in those days no Republican Congressman from Michigan would have dared to join with Southern Democrats in watering down a voting bill intended to open the polls to Negro voters in States where now they are all but disfranchised.

NEGRO VOTE KEPT ILLINOIS REPUBLICAN

My adopted State of Illinois for many long years was hopelessly Republican, but this was largely true because the Negro vote was overwhelmingly Republican. It may come as a surprise to some, but it is worth noting, that in all the long years that Illinois was safely in the Republican column the margin of Republican victory as a rule was less than the Negro Republican vote. In those years no Republican Congressman from Illinois would have dared to join with Southern Democrats in watering down a voting bill intended to open the polls to Negro voters in States where now they are permitted neither to register nor vote.

The first political speech that I made was in the African Methodist Church in Benton Harbor when I was a high school boy. I was courteously received and was accorded a bit of applause at the conclusion of my remarks, the sort of encouragement that good hearts give to beginners, but I doubt that I made any converts to the democratic cause.

The Negro vote was loyally, solidly in the Republican column, and it remained there year after year, election after election, despite the fact that Congress after Congress, overwhelmingly under Republican control, did absolutely nothing to change the registering and voting practices of Southern States that closed the door on Negro voters.

BIPARTISAN CRUSADE OF MORALITY

Mr. Chairman, interrupting briefly the continuity of what I have to say, I pause here to remark that in the legislative pursuit of objectives of morality there is no place for the play for partisan advantage.

I deeply regret that in the consideration of the present bill there has been a departure from that which we witnessed in this Chamber in 1964 and which gave thrill and inspiration to all mankind, Democrats and Republicans working side by side for a cause in which all believed and cherished so precious that none would think to mar with partisan grasping the purity of the crusade of morality.

The plain blunt truth is that the watering down of this bill would mean the defeat of all for which good people of both parties have so long and valiantly been battling. If this were not already apparent to everyone, certainly it became as plain as the hand held before the eyes when opponents of civil rights and voting reforms urged the adoption of the Republican substitute over the administration bill.

You do not have to be smart to see what has been painted out for you in letters as high as a giant.

It is true the legislative medicine in the administration bill is strong, but may I respectfully suggest that ills as deeply rooted as those we attack are not subject to the aspirin treatment.

INFLUENCE OF GROWING-UP YEARS

Now, Mr. Chairman, I shall return to a narrative of the circumstances of my upbringing that afford the reason for my being what I am. In my sincere acceptance of all men as my brothers, I appreciate, too, that others who grew up in a different social climate cling loyally and with the same sincerity as do I to the order and the philosophy of their growing-up years. In time they will come to accept the changes that have come and to know that it is all for the best.

Change, Mr. Chairman, is life. Without motion, which is change, there would be no life.

There is no permanent status quo, although it happens that an established order endures through several generations, its gradual diminution unnoticed, and its adherents come to look at it as a permanent and sacred thing. Then comes the revelation of the change that has been taking form all the years, and it comes as a shock.

The fact is, Mr. Chairman, that what the 88th Congress accomplished in the enactment of the most sweeping civil rights law in history and what the 89th Congress is on the eve of accomplishing with the enactment of a voting law that really and truly will open the ballot boxes to our Negro fellow Americans did not come of a sudden and unannounced.

RIGHT OUTLIVES THE FOOT THAT CRUSHES IT

They were long in coming, but each year brought them closer.

Right is immortal. It may be crushed to earth but it outlives the foot that crushes it. That is the story and the history of mankind. That is the lesson of the ages, illustrated in every upward push of man in his long climb from the caves, after each slipping back, ultimately another forward plunge that reached heights never before attained.

Mr. Chairman, I came to the Congress in 1949. I then was 67 years old and had lived a full life. I resolved that in this body as long as the good Lord gave me the strength and my constituents at home in their goodness returned me I should never spare myself in combat against discrimination in every form and in every manifestation whenever it showed its ugly face.

I have been in every fight for civil rights and for voting equality, for laws against lynching and poll taxes, and all the line of cruel and undemocratic practices, since I have been a Member of this body. In several Congresses I have served with other Democratic and Republican colleagues on bipartisan joint steering committees for civil rights legislation. I always have felt, Mr. Chairman, that the advancement of morality and equality knew no party lines, and, as a rule, such has been the case.

IN JULY 9 YEARS AGO

In the civil rights fight in 1956, now 9 years ago, I made the following remarks,

which are as timely now as then, and which I reiterate at this time:

Mr. Chairman, when I walked in the sunshine to the Capitol today I was thinking that there was some seasonal significance in the timing of this historic debate. We are in the last fortnight of July and all the signs are of a summer in its full enraptment. Yet the change came on June 21, when the days started to shorten and since then summer has been on the path of death. That is the way of life. Life is change. There is no enduring status quo. But the change from one order to another is not immediately discernible. Man is reluctant to embrace change until by nature it is forced upon him. He fears the unknown and the untried, but when it comes creeping upon him and engulfing him he finds in the climate of a new order the exhilaration of one who has climbed tediously a mountainside and having attained the peak looks out upon the vista of a new world.

I have listened to my colleagues from the Southland who have stood gallantly on the edge of a lost battlefield fighting for an order that they sense, if they do not know, is gone forever. There have been many such instances in the long history of man's climbing to higher plateaus of human dignity and human contentment.

Because I am older than many of my colleagues, I can look back further. There are two ways of understanding the present as it is related to the past. One way is by reading of the experiences of the yesteryears, another way, understanding through the experience of having lived in those yesteryears.

On this afternoon in late July, when, though the sun be shining, summer is already nearly a month on her path of death, may I take you back with me to the era when the 19th century was rushing onward, to be engulfed by the 20th century. Political philosophers then were saying that wherever the banana grows man is incapable of self-government. A President of the United States publicly proclaimed that he had never broken bread with a Negro. John L. Sullivan disclaimed being champion of the world because he said he would not lower the white race by entering the same ring with Peter Jackson, a Negro.

That was the era in which something transpired that left me with an ineffaceable memory. It was before the turn of the century. The memory that with me is ineffaceable is framed with the vivid background of a gorgeously beautiful sunset in the tropics. My father was talking to a great physician of South America, one of the outstanding physicians of the world at that period. This man had been eloquent in the expression of his affection for the United States. My father remarked that having such great admiration for our country he hoped that this great physician someday would visit our shores. The expression on the physician's face changed. "That I cannot trust myself to do," he said.

"I want always to go on admiring the great contribution that the United States has made to all the world and to all of

July 15, 1965

mankind, but if I went to New York or Chicago and were not admitted to one of your hotels because there is Negro blood in my veins could I understand?"

Later a few years there was another experience. I was on duty with two Cuban Negro soldiers, penetrating within the Spanish lines at Santiago. We were lost in hostile territory. We had one canteen of water and that one canteen of water we passed one to the other without the thought that some of the lips that touched the canteen were white and some were black. Never after that could I understand why in my own country, and in my own northland at the time, the dining rooms and public eating places were closed to those not of the white race.

Mr. Chairman, we have come a long, long way. The old order as far as the North is concerned is all but gone. The old order as far as the South is concerned is in the late July of a dying summer. Industry in the South is expanding. Ahead of the South lies a future of prosperity beyond the rosiest dreams of the old plantation days. The fears of the gallant little band of my colleagues making the last stand for the status quo will be proven as groundless as were the fears of countless other gallant little bands in the long history of the world making the last stand for the status quo. Again change is ushering in new orders advancing the dignity and the contentment of mankind. The bill we in the House will pass this week will mark another milestone in our country's march to meet her destiny as the servitor under God of all mankind.

NEAR THE END OF LONG HARD FIGHT

Mr. Chairman, those remarks were made in this Chamber 9 years ago this month of July. Even 7 years before that we had fought all through the day and all through the night until near 5 o'clock in the morning for some semblance of recognition of the civil rights of all Americans. I was happy and felt privileged that in this it was given unto me to play my part, small though it may have been, I then being in my first term.

It indeed has been a long hard fight. With the enactment of H.R. 6400 I shall have a sense of security that the cause of equality in opportunity, in the enjoyment by all Americans of the blessings, responsibilities, and privileges of running this country of ours, at last is planted on firm ground. This is a good bill and it will open the polling places to all Americans of good repute regardless of race or color.

Mr. Chairman, ours will be a greater and a happier country because of what now we are about to do. Strength that is rested on morality is an enduring strength. A representative democracy in which all citizens share according to worth and without distinction on lines of race, color, religion, station, sex, and may I add age, inevitably must produce the kind of government that never can be wiped from this earth.

No race can live alone. By all of us blessed with American citizenship working together, one for all and all for one, voting together and working together on a basis of equality and mutual respect, all

that the Lord of our creation intended for us will fall to our lot.

I think, too, Mr. Chairman, that we have learned that in the world of today, narrowed as it has been by quick means of transportation, no nation can live alone. Surely if we as a nation have set the pattern in unity envisioned in the legislation we are here considering its influence cannot be lost on the world.

JUDICIARY, A HARD WORKING COMMITTEE

I cannot close without adding my voice to the universal acclaim of the great chairman of the Judiciary Committee, Mr. CELLER, whose stout championship of the cause of civil rights during many long years constitutes an epic in the legislative history of our country. I also join in expression of appreciation of the large contribution of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROGERS], the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO], and the others on the committee who worked so long and so faithfully in a difficult and complex field, and not forgetting William R. Foley, the able and dedicated general counsel of the committee. While I regret that the distinguished ranking minority member of the Judiciary Committee, Mr. McCULLOCH, loaned his name to the watered-down substitute here offered, I cannot forget, nor should the country forget, that he stood, shoulder to shoulder, with Chairman CELLER in the stirring days in 1964 that ended with the enactment with bipartisan support of the greatest civil rights law of all times.

I think, Mr. Chairman, all my colleagues will agree that the quality and character of the membership both Democratic and Republican of the Judiciary Committee is extraordinarily high, a source of pride to all of us.

Research Grant to Montana State University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ARNOLD OLSEN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 15, 1965

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following KBMN radio editorial:

[A KBMN (Bozeman, Mont.) radio editorial, July 15, 1965]
M.S.U. GRANT

My fellow Montanans, recently the National Aeronautics and Space Administration has announced a grant of \$100,000 to Montana State University at Bozeman for research in space science and engineering. This grant is to support a broad integrated program of space-related research activities which are being carried on at the Bozeman campus.

The research supported by this grant will include projects in atomic physics, astrophysics, botany, bacteriology, and chemistry. The grant is directed toward the progress of pure science in these areas and is a small example of the massive effort our Government is making in financing pure science research. The money is well spent. Pure science is the basis of tomorrow's inventions.

Without this work, the practical applications, improving our lives in the future, will not be forthcoming.

A wonderful example of this type of development is the Early Bird Satellite which was recently put in space by the Communication Satellite Corp. We are now in instant radio and TV communication with Europe and Japan, and we are expecting commercial use of the satellite in the near future. But this would not have been possible if the road had not been paved by research and development sponsored by our Government.

There is no direct profit to be derived from pure science research, and, because of this, the business community is reluctant to invest money for it. Moreover, the amounts needed are far too great for even the largest businesses in the country. Our Government must provide the necessary funds.

The \$100,000 grant to the Bozeman campus is a compliment to the fine educational institution there, and it makes me proud to know that fellow Montanans are participating in the American effort in space. I want to congratulate those involved in the work, and I wish them the best of luck in their studies.

Fe O. Madden
President Johnson's Strategy for Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 15, 1965

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Christian Science Monitor reveals in a few words a message, the spirit of which, if followed through will be the most sensible path toward the Vietnam settlement.

A TALE OF TWO TALKS

We believe that American Ambassador at large W. Averell Harriman has done right to go to Moscow. We also believe that British Prime Minister Harold Wilson was right to send his friend, Harold Davies, to Hanoi. For, even though nothing concrete comes from either visit, each is an earnest that the English-speaking world is ready to talk, to talk again, and to keep right on talking in the hope of reaching a negotiated end to the Vietnamese conflict.

The United States, with the welcome help of its British ally, owes it to itself and to the world both to overlook no chance for peace talks and to keep on trying to bring them about. These efforts are a token of moral strength, not of weakness. They are also wise statesmanship, for it is essential that Washington prove to the world that American involvement in Vietnam is on behalf of justice and not of neocolonialism.

During the past quarter century there have been few Americans whom the Russians have gotten to know better or have a stronger reason to trust than Mr. Harriman. While his presence alone will not dispel the deep Soviet-American rift which has grown out of the Vietnamese crisis, it should serve as an indication to Moscow that Washington still values "peaceful coexistence" with the Soviet Union and continues to hope that the time will come when Moscow feels able to take some further initiative to bring about peace talks on southeast Asia.

Similarly, Mr. Davies' visit, which got short shrift in Hanoi, will help make it clearer to the Afro-Asian world which side it is that is seeking talks and which side is turning them down. Prime Minister Wilson has not had an easy time over the Davies' visit and

July 15, 1965

A3785

he is to be commended for having persisted.

It is also to be hoped that Hanoi's cold-shouldering of Mr. Davies will help lay a persistent oversimplification widely held in Europe and also believed in some American quarters: The American bombing of North Vietnam is what prevents peace talks. The Communists refuse to talk because they believe they will win. Once let them lose that belief and the bombing in the north will speed their rush to the conference table.

Twentieth Anniversary of the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 15, 1965

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, as we commemorate the 20th anniversary of the United Nations we cannot help but look in retrospect at the state of the world 20 years after World War I and 20 years after World War II. It is necessary to compare the war-ravaged, totalitarian-ensconced world of 1939 with the prosperous and flourishing free world of today. In this way the effectiveness of the United Nations as a peacekeeping, world-stabilizing organization will be crystal clear. It is evident that the world is today troubled in southeast Asia and in the Caribbean. However, one must look at the world in 1939 to see the marked difference in international affairs since the inception of the world organization.

The powers never really straightened themselves out after Versailles at the conclusion of the war that was fought "to end all wars." A lack of cooperation both at home and abroad doomed the Versailles settlement to failure and American refusal to cooperate transformed a potentially powerful League of Nations into a floundering and ineffectual debating organization, unable to halt the onslaught of the Nazi-Fascist tyranny. Obstinacy and shortsightedness did irreparable damage to worldwide hopes for a peaceful future. The dream of avoiding a second war was smashed on the rocks of party politics and ethnocentric narrowness.

The German march into Poland, the Italian attack on Ethiopia, and the Japanese takeover of Manchuria were marked by a reproof word, but by little action. The impotency of the League unmistakably brought nearer and accelerated the horrors of World War II.

In 1945 the executive, legislative and diplomatic leadership of the country were determined that such a tragedy must be averted in the future. At San Francisco they designed the framework of a united organization which would not crumble helplessly as the League did. A bipartisan coalition insured national support for the international program. Inactivity in the twenties and thirties was supplanted by intervention in the forties and fifties. The United States has not swerved from its position of firm support in the past decades and its desire

to continue support is reflected in the resolution which passed the House last Tuesday. When the interim 20 years between foundation and maturity are re-examined, we must marvel at the relative degree of stability which has been achieved in the world through U.N. cooperation.

Its detractors are quick to jump at its weaknesses and to obscure its accomplishments. They ignore totally the humanitarian work done through the various social and economic programs, through UNESCO, through UNICEF, through the Food and Agriculture Organization. Millions of children have received relief fund dollars and diet staples in lands where there are no welfare programs to help those with no means of support. Millions of poverty stricken farmers have received technological help and scientific aid where their own governments either could not or would not institute programs of their own. These accomplishments are real and are being perpetuated every day.

Besides these achievements the United Nations has played the integral role in its 20 years of age as the peacekeeper of the world. U.N. mediation stopped fighting in Palestine in 1948 and in Indonesia in 1949. U.N. military action ended the Korean war in 1953 and a U.N. Emergency Force resolved the Suez crisis in 1956. An observer task force negotiated a peace in Lebanon in 1958. Each of these incidents could easily have been the catalyst for a third war—existence of the U.N., however, averted such difficulty and resulted in a more peaceful world.

There is no question in my mind, Mr. Speaker, that the world has been made safer and better by the existence of the United Nations. Although there is tension and conflict today in the Far East, it would be greatly intensified if there was no peacekeeping organization of all the nations.

The 20 years under the leadership of Trygve Lie, Dag Hammarskjöld and U Thant have been a testimonial to world cooperation. Let us hope that the member nations will continue to act in a spirit conducive to permanent peace through reason and justice.

Adlai Stevenson

SPEECH

OF

HON. THOMAS C. McGRATH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 14, 1965

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, the people of the United States and the entire world are grieved and shocked at the sudden passing of a great American, Ambassador Adlai Stevenson. His dedication to the ideal of freedom, his zeal in the pursuit of peace, his deep feeling of the importance of the individual are all qualities rarely found embodied in a single human being.

One measure of his greatness was the respect which he was accorded by his

antagonists in the world council he served so faithfully as the U.S. Ambassador. Another is the universal sadness and sense of loss felt around the world today.

Ambassador Stevenson had the facility for cutting into the heart of any matter and the ability to express his ideas in a forceful manner. He will long be remembered as a champion of liberty and peace. The memory of his mission, his loyalty to his country, his unceasing quest for freedom for all, and his humaneness toward all mankind will surely inspire all of us in some measure as we seek the fulfillment of his goals.

Eight Thousand Pounds of Killer Whale on a "Leash"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FLOYD V. HICKS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 15, 1965

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, two enterprising young gentlemen from my hometown of Tacoma, Wash., have undertaken a whale of a project.

They have, to oversimplify it a bit, put an 8,000-pound killer whale on a leash and are leading him home.

James S. Griffin, a Tacoma businessman, and his brother, Ted, who operates an aquarium in Seattle, bought the killer whale in Namu, British Columbia, and with great ingenuity, substantial outlays of cash, and the help of many people and organizations are moving the sea-going giant 400 miles south to Seattle. The whale and his escorts are expected to arrive at Seattle next Monday.

There the whale, whose name is "Namu," will take up residence in Ted Griffin's aquarium for all to see. Namu also will be the object of intensive scientific study, for he is the only killer whale in captivity in the world.

Mr. Speaker, Tacoma's waterfront reporter, Don Hannula, has told this entire modern saga of the sea in the Tacoma News Tribune. To permit my colleagues to share the thrills and vicissitudes of the Griffin brothers, Namu, and others involved in this adventure, I am pleased to present Mr. Hannula's story in its entirety.

[From the Tacoma (Wash.) News Tribune, July 11, 1965]

(By Don Hannula)

EIGHT THOUSAND POUNDS OF KILLER WHALE ON A "LEASH"

Tacoma fuel dealer Jim Griffin will tell you frankly that he doesn't know the difference between a guppy and a goldfish.

But all of a sudden, Griffin, vice president and general manager of Griffin-Galbraith Fuel Co., has a whale of a fish problem.

Seems his brother Ted, a former Tacoman who now operates the Seattle Marine Aquarium, bit off more than one man could chew when he decided to bring a 22-foot, 8,000-pound killer whale 400 miles from Namu, British Columbia, to Seattle.

The whale, accidentally caught by two gill-netters off Namu, June 1, was put on the block for sale after the fishermen constructed

July 15, 1965

A3786

a gillnet prison. Griffin bought it for \$8,000, but that was just the beginning of his financial problems.

MONEY DISAPPEARING

Already he has close to \$20,000 sunk in the venture.

Ted, 29, asked brother Jim, 28, for assistance in raising money to get the whale to Seattle. Jim has a simple explanation for his involvement in Ted's killer whale adventure which has received nationwide attention:

"He's my brother."

Another Tacoman, Point Defiance Aquarist Don Goldsberry, has been playing a leading role in the effort to bring the world's only captive killer whale to Seattle. On leave of absence from his job, he has lent his expert advice to Ted Griffin since the start.

"If it hadn't been for Don Goldsberry, they probably would not have the whale now," Jim Griffin said.

Keeping the whale confined has been a struggle since the beginning. As many as 30 other killer whales patrolled the confinement area apparently waiting to make a rescue attempt.

But they disappeared last Wednesday. It is expected they will be back at the side of Namu (Klingit Indian language meaning "many winds") the killer whale before the long haul south is over.

IN THE BAG

Friday, Namu was in the bag and en route to a new home. He was driven into a specially constructed pen of oil drums, nets and steel tubing. The tiny Seattle tug *Robert E. Lee*, operated by disk jockey and channel 11 television personality Bob Hardwick, was unable to tow the big pen, so Griffin hired a 78-foot seiner, the *Chamiss Bay*, to pull the pen to Point Hardy, about 100 miles south on the northern end of Vancouver Island.

It was expected to arrive in Point Hardy this evening. There the whale will remain in calm, protected waters until the Griffin brothers are ready for their next move.

GET ASSISTANCE

Saturday, the Navy and the Fish and Wildlife Service offered help, but they did not have facilities immediately available. Jim was able, however, to get help from Drew Foss, who volunteered the tugboat, *Ivar Foss*. The tug left Tacoma Saturday and expects to begin hauling Namu from Point Hardy by Monday night.

Even with the 65-foot tug and its 6-man crew pulling the whale, Foss said it probably could not make more than 2 or 3 knots without breaking up the pen which is confining the whale.

A Navy floating drydock had been considered to haul the whale to Seattle, or even an Air Force Globemaster, Jim said.

In all it would take an estimated 7 to 10 days for the trip.

Meanwhile, Namu, the friendly killer whale, seems content to eat about 200 pounds of fresh salmon a day for a \$100 daily food bill.

Jim Griffin who talked to brother Ted by phone said the whale seemed to like its new pen. It had been feared the whale wouldn't eat once inside the pen.

But, Namu is consuming 200-300 pounds of salmon a day now, Ted told his brother Saturday. He said fishermen come along side and throw fish to the whale to see him react.

"Ted said the whale was eating fine inside the pen," Jim reported. "But he'll only take fresh salmon. If they throw him an old salmon, he throws it back."

There had been rumors that Ted Griffin might want to put his killer whale temporarily in the Titlow Lagoon here. Presently the lagoon owned by the metropolitan park district but leased to the State fisheries department is free of salmon fingerling.

However, Ted Griffin said, if he can get the whale to Seattle that's as far as he will go.

HAS TANK

When he built a 100,000-gallon tank last summer for porpoise and seals, he constructed one bigger than his needs demanded. He did this with the hope that he would someday realize his burning ambition to capture a killer whale alive.

Griffin says the tank is suitable for the whale if he can ever get it to Seattle.

Brother Jim related that Ted seemed "depressed" the last time they talked by phone.

It's understandable—with \$20,000 sunk into a whale which could break loose at any time. Then there's the matter of raising another \$10,000 to complete the job—if no help is forthcoming from the Government which would like to do research on Namu.

But a part of the some \$30,000 the brothers have already spent is safe. Lloyds of London has agreed to insure a substantial part of the whale's purchase price.

Will Ted Griffin let \$20,000 swim away if he comes up against a stone wall?

Never, says brother Jim. He says Ted has promised: "I'm going to get that whale to Seattle. I don't know how, but I'm going to get it there."

The St. John's University Men's Chorus of Collegeville, Minn.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEC G. OLSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 15, 1965

Mr. OLSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, a fine musical organization from my district, the St. John's University Men's Chorus of Collegeville, Minn., has just completed its third successful European tour. I have just received word that the chorus won first place in folk singing competition at the Llangollen International Eisteddfod in Llangollen Wales. In addition, it finished third in overall competition and was praised for a "finely united performance" by Dr. Herbert Howells, head of the board of judges. The St. John's Chorus is directed by Mr. Gerhard Track who directed the famed Vienna Choirboys for 5 years before joining the St. John's Music Department.

I ask that a portion of a news story from the St. Paul, Minn., Dispatch, July 7, be appended to my remarks:

LLANGOLLEN, WALES.—The St. John's University Men's Chorus from Minnesota won the first prize today in one of the major competitions at the Llangollen International Eisteddfod, a group singing competition.

They took the first prize and an international trophy in the contest for folk-song parties. There were 24 choirs in the competition, representing 14 different countries. The St. John's team was awarded 180 marks.

The St. John's choir from Collegeville had been on a European tour and Llangollen was its last place of call.

In giving the adjudication, Dr. Solon Michaelides of Greece said: "The St. John's music was beautifully graded with rhythmic feeling. The blending was excellent throughout."

"It is a choir with very large vocal resources. In their second song a tenor solo was very expressive and well supported by the

rest of the choir. They built up a climax in a wonderful way. They were always excellent without losing their tone color. The choir is a virtile ensemble."

Adlai E. Stevenson

SPEECH

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 14, 1965

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial by Robert R. Brunn recollects some interesting but forgotten events in the life of the great statesman, Adlai E. Stevenson.

ADLAI E. STEVENSON: ADROIT WARRIOR FOR PEACE

(By Robert R. Brunn)

WASHINGTON.—Adlai E. Stevenson, who passed on in London Wednesday, was an extraordinarily deft and adroit representative of the United States on the global stage at the United Nations.

Free of the anguish of two grueling presidential campaigns in 1952 and again in 1956, Mr. Stevenson settled down to a spirited defense of U.S. foreign policy and action.

No American politician in this century was ever to shape a phrase with more telling intellectual effect. But in facing Dwight D. Eisenhower in two campaigns, he knew deep inside that it probably was a losing battle.

Under President Kennedy he took up the struggle for peace with gusto—and an elegant phrase. He spoke out for international justice and for wisdom in handling the global Communist threat.

At the time of his passing Wednesday in London, he had been talking with British officials about southeast Asia and had seen Foreign Secretary Michael Stewart that morning.

Looking back on his two campaigns Mr. Stevenson once said this:

"There is evidence that those campaigns were worthwhile; that they saw a quickening, an awakening, of political purpose in the minds of many thinking Americans; that they aroused a new or broader sense of personal responsibility in political affairs, a large respect for the political process, a sense of ideals attainable through political activity."

"I like to think they reduced the snobbery about politics; that there is more realization that free society demands the wisest kind of political leadership; that without politics there can be no democratic freedom, not even the freedom to be 'above politics.'"

"And I have never felt any sense of defeat for the ideas of talking sense, of tackling the hard issues, of telling the truth, in a political campaign."

"It is extremely important that those who have taken part in this invigoration of the political process take up again now the cudgels they wielded so gloriously before."

President Johnson was visibly moved by the news of Mr. Stevenson's passing as he went through the motions of shaking hands with members of a Japanese trade mission who were his guests.

Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN, Republican, of Vermont, said Mr. Stevenson "did his work conscientiously and he did it well." He added it was unfortunate that "now, perhaps when he is needed more than ever, he has been called away."

In campaigning in the 1960 campaign, Mr. Stevenson indicated his future role in the